## **United States Court of Appeals FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT**

\_\_\_\_

	No. 06-3426
United States of America,	*
Appellee,	* *
V.	<ul><li>* Appeal from the United States</li><li>* District Court for the</li></ul>
Thomas Finley,	<ul><li>* Eastern District of Missouri.</li><li>*</li></ul>
Appellant.	* [UNPUBLISHED]

Submitted: July 18, 2007 Filed: July 23, 2007

\_\_\_\_

Before MURPHY, SMITH, and SHEPHERD, Circuit Judges.

\_\_\_\_\_

## PER CURIAM.

Thomas Finley appeals the district court's order denying his motion for review of his 216-month prison sentence, imposed in 1998 following his murder-for-hire convictions. See United States v. Finley, 175 F.3d 645, 646-47 (8th Cir. 1999). Finley's motion, which he characterized as an "appeal of an otherwise final sentence pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3742(a)(1) & (2)," was actually a successive and untimely 28 U.S.C. § 2255 motion, filed without authorization. See United States v. Patton, 309 F.3d 1093, 1094 (8th Cir. 2002) (per curiam) (inmates may not bypass authorization

Appellate Case: 06-3426 Page: 1 Date Filed: 07/23/2007 Entry ID: 3332296

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>The Honorable Stephen N. Limbaugh, United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Missouri.

requirement in 28 U.S.C. § 2244 for successive § 2255 motions by purporting to invoke some other procedure); <u>United States v. Auman</u>, 8 F.3d 1268, 1270-71 (8th Cir. 1993) (noting § 3742 concerns basis for appellate review of district court's sentencing decisions; it does not grant jurisdiction to district court to review final sentence). Accordingly, we affirm. <u>See</u> 8th Cir. R. 47B.